

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addease COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1430 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.webjo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/662,751	09/15/2003	James D. Goss	67397-036 PUS1	1549
54549 CARLSON, G	7590 05/12/200 ASKEY & OLDS/PRA	EXAMINER		
400 WEST MAPLE ROAD SUITE 350 BIRMINGHAM, MI 48009			KRAUSE, JUSTIN MITCHELL	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	,		3682	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/12/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/662,751	GOSS ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
JUSTIN KRAUSE	3682	
Examiner	Art Unit	

The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on	the cover sheet with the correspondence address		
THE REPLY FILED 15 April 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICAT	ION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.		
	: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the h appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request		
The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date o	f the final rejection		
 The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than 	Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In n SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.		
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).	Y CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO		
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortens et forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office letter han the may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL.	and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee ad statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as		
The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance	with 37 CER 41 37 must be filed within two months of the date of		
	nereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since		
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but price	or to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because		
(a) They raise new issues that would require further considera			
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);			
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better forr appeal; and/or			
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresp	onding number of finally rejected claims.		
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).			
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See	attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).		
Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):	·		
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling non-allowable claim(s). 			
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided b. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected:			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but befon because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and suffic was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	e or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be entered ient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and		
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcon showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and w 	ne all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a		
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	e status of the claims after entry is below or attached.		
The request for reconsideration has been considered but does See Continuation Sheet.	NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:		
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/S	SB/08) Paper No(s)		
13. Other:			
/Richard WL Ridley/	/J. K./		
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3682	Examiner, Art Unit 3682		

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 08-06) Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The claims stand as rejected in the final rejection, Applicant's attempt to clarify the original drawings through the use of arrows within the remarks is not persuasive, as the arrow denoting what is purported to be a raised area on the second side of the spring is appears to be directed at element 40, not at any part of the spring 38. Applicant has conceded the original drawings are improper. Repeated reviews of the drawings as originally show no evidence of a second raised portion on a side opposite the first raised portion within the drawings as originally filed.

Applicant recites a definition for a believille spring and washer, and the makes the unsupported conclusory statement "each of which utilize the term washer which is synonymous with planar," (4/15/08 remarks, page 11). The examiner disagrees with the contention that a washer is synonymous with planar, particularly in view of applicants supplied definitions which clearly recite that a believille spring is a "conical shaped washer" and that a believille washer is a "cupped spring washer", both of which like in three planes, and therefore, neither of which are planar.

Applicant's arguments regarding Baninger are not persuasive. First, claim 8 recites no limitations nelated to a spring of any kind. The claims are not in condition for allowance as Baninger discloses all of the elements recited within the claim. Further, placent's amendments do not limit the scope of the claims to a single spring, there is no recitation within the claims prohibiting the claim from reading as a plurality of spring elements functioning tocether as a single spring.